DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 664 EA 018 397

AUTHOR Andrews, Richard L.; And Others
TITLE Principal Roles, Other In-School Variables, and Academic Achievement by Ethnicity and SES.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 86
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Administrator Role; Analysis of Variance; Black Students; Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Principals; Regression (Statistics); *School Supervision; Statistical Significance; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS California Achievement Tests; Staff Assessment Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

This 3-year study, part of the Effective Schools Project of the Seattle School District and the University of Washington, was undertaken to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal as instructional leader and average gain scores of students in 67 elementary schools in Seattle. Scores were disaggregated by student ethnicity and student free lunch status as a surrogate measure of socioeconomic status (SES). Data pertaining to teacher perceptions of the principal as instructional leader were obtained through the Staff Assessment Questionnaire, and specific attention was given to four general aspects of principal behavior: (1) mobilizing resources, (2) communicating, (3) serving as instructional resource, and (4) being a visible presence. These data were then correlated with school means for aggregated student improvement on Total Reading and Total Mathematics of the California Achievement Test (CAT). Individual gains for students were computed and aggregated for four groups: white, black, free lunch, and non-free lunch. Regression analyses were used to assess the relationships between the leadership of the principal and other effective school characteristics, while analysis of variance was used to assess the effects of leadership on student gain scores. The findings of this study suggest that teachers' perceptions of the principal as instructional leader are critical to the reading and mathematics achievement of students, particularly among historically low-achieving groups of students. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard L. Andrews

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED268664

PRINCIPAL ROLES, OTHER IN-SCHOOL VARIABLES, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT BY ETHNICITY AND SES

Richard L. Andrews
Professor, Policy, Governance and Adminstration

Roger Soder
Special Assistant to the Dean

Dan Jacoby
Research Assistant

University of Washington
College of Education

A paper presented at the 1986 AERA Annual Meeting
in San Francisco, California
20 April 1986

EA 018 397

PRINCIPAL ROLES, OTHER IN-SCHOOL VARIABLES, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT BY ETHNICITY AND SES

Perspective

The school principalship has been the subject of hundreds of studies over the past thirty years. The central role of the principal has been viewed, variously, as building manager, administrator, politician, change agent, boundary spanner, and instructional leader. Principal attributes and hypothesized correlates that have been selected for investigation in the many studies are in large part derived from value stances concerning the relative importance assigned these several roles (Glasman, 1984).

During the last decade, value stances have tended to center on the principal as instructional leader, accountable for the academic achievement of students. Taken collectively, the "effective schools" body of research studies (see, e.g., Lezotte and Passalacqua, 1978; Frederiksen and Edmonds, 1979; Edmonds, 1978; Edmonds, 1979a; Edmonds, 1979b; Edmonds and Frederiksen, 1979; Brookover et al., 1979; Brookover and Lezotte, 1977; Weber, 1971; Lipham, 1981) tends to reflect the view of Sweeney:

> The direct responsibility for improving instruction and learning rests in the hands of school principals. Do principals of schools with high achievement exhibit any particular leadership behavior? Research suggests that they do. (1982, p. 346)

The studies of this type tend to examine those schools in which achievement levels are high for all students, or where achievement differences betweeen subpopulations of students (e.g., low SES vs. high SES) are minimal, in attempts to isolate commonalities among in-school variables. This approach has been criticized for its emphasis on "outlier" schools (Glasman, 1984; Purkey and Smith, 1982; Purkey and Smith, 1983; Mackenzie, 1983); others have noted that patterns of principal leadership, commonly cited as critical variables in "effective" schools can be observed in "ineffective" schools as well (e.g., Wellisch et al., 1978).

The research described here was undertaken to investigate the relationship between perceptions of the principal as instructional leader and average gain scores of students in 67 elementary schools in the Seattle School District, with scores disaggregated by student ethnicity and student free-lunch status as a surrogate measure of SES. The study assumes the value stance of Sweeney (i.e., the principal as instructional leader, responsible for student academic achievement). Further, the study moves beyond the limits of the outlier school approach, in that virtually all elementary schools were included.

The study is part of the Effective Schools Project of the Seattle School District and the University of Washington College of Education.

Initiated in 1982, the on-going collaborative project is designed to improve all of the district's schools and special programs through a variety of efforts. These efforts, and the political/social context of these efforts, have been described elsewhere in detail (see Andrews and Soder, 1985a; Andrews and Soder, 1985b; Andrews, Houston, and Soder, 1985; Soder and Andrews, 1984; Soder and Andrews, 1985); therefore, only those circumstances bearing on the particular study at hand are presented here.

Collection, analysis, and provision of data pertaining to 12 quality indicators of schools--along with analysis of academic achievement data disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status--are integral elements of the project. One of those quality indicators, as identified early on by the district on the basis of an extensive review of the literature, is the leadership of the principal.

A group of College of Education faculty members and district educators worked jointly to develop means to assess perceptions of leadership in each of the district's schools. Based on further reviews of the literature, the means that were developed center on four general aspects of principal behavior: (1) mobilizing resources, (2) communicating, (3) serving as instructional resource, and (4) being a visible presence. Each of these behaviors is described briefly in the sections that follow.

Mobilizing Resources

Resource provision may be described as those actions the principal takes to marshal personnel, building, district, and community resources to achieve the vision and goals of the school (Torrens and Wing, 1986). Resources may be seen as materials (Persell and Cookson, 1982) or as information (Schmuck, 1985), with the principal acting as interpreter of, and broker for, shared meanings (Sergiovanni, 1984).

Communicating

Clear communication of vision is, as Sergiovanni suggests, "purposing" --that is, "emphasizing selective attention (the modeling of important goals and behavior) signals others of what is of importance and value" (1984, p. 7). The literature suggests that principals in high-performing schools demonstrate a commitment to goals; they are able to articulate a vision of instructional goals as a mechanism for integrating instructional planning (see, e.g., Manasse, 1984; Dow and Whitehead, 1980; Gross, Giaquinta, and Bernstein, 1971; Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Reinhardt et al., 1979; Rosenblum and Jastrzab, 1980).

Acting as Instructional Resource

Lipham suggests that improvement of teaching and learning is the "foremost function of the principal" (1981, p. 12). The principal "is actively involved in all aspects of the instructional program, sets expectations for continuous improvement and collegiality, models the kinds of behaviors desired, participates in inservice training with teachers and consistently gives priority to instructional concerns" (Torrens and Wing, 1986. p. 18). The importance of the instructional resource role has been noted by, inter alia, Sapone (1985), Austin (1979), and Fullan (1981).

Being a Visible Presence

Walking in the hallways, visiting classrooms, attending departmental or grade level meetings, and holding spontaneous conversations with staff members and students are examples of being a visible presence. As one teacher put it, "He is always around and about the school -- in classrooms, in hallways, at special events. You see him everwhere. He really knows what is going on in this school" (Rutherford, 1985). The visible presence role aspect has been noted by, inter alia, Wilson (1982), Brookover et al. (1982), Giammatteo (1981), DeBovoise (1972), Murphy, (1983), and Innaccone and Jamochian (1985).

Using these four aspects of principal behavior as the grounding for instrument development, draft instruments were devised, tested, and further refined. The following section presents a discussion of the methodology of instrument development along with a discussion of data sources.

Data Sources

The study reported here was begun in 1982 with 67 elementary schools and was completed in June 1985. To examine the relationship between the staff's perception of strong leadership and (1) student improvement on achievement tests and (2) other perceived characteristics of schools, several variables were constructed for each elementary school. These variables included school means for aggregated student improvement on Total Reading and Total Mathematics of the California Achievement Test (CAT), a principal leadership scale, and other school characteristics.

Academic Achievement

The CAT was administered to all children by classroom groups in each of the schools during April 1982, 1983, and 1984. To be considered as a subject in the sample, a student had to be enrolled in the same school over the two-year test time. The sample of schools used in the study consisted of 33 of the elementary schools where sufficient achievement data were obtained to allow for reliable and valid conclusions. Each school had ten or more students in each of the disaggregated groups (White, Black, Free Lunch, Non-Free Lunch). A listing of schools, leadership score, average gain scores, and number of subjects in each group is presented in Appendix A.

The improvement measure was constructed from individual student normal curve equivalent (NCE) CAT score differences on Total Reading and Total Mathematics from Spring 1982 to Spring 1984. Individual gains for every student present at the same school during 1983 and 1984 were computed and aggregated within schools for all students and by ethnicity, and free-lunch status. The year-end 1982 tests provide a reasonable base for school effects over the 1982-84 biennium, regardless whether a student was enrolled in the school during 1982.

Principal as Instructional Leader

Data pertaining to teacher perceptions of the principal as instructional leader were obtained through administration of the Staff Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ). A copy of the SAQ is included in Appendix B.

Developed collaboratively by practicing teachers and administrators in the school district and the University of Washington research team, the SAQ consists of 167 Likert-type items measuring nine school factors (strong leadership, staff dedication, staff expectations of students, identification of learning difficulties, multicultural education, sex equity, curriculum continuity, learning climate, and frequency of monitoring of student progress). Nineteen of the items pertain to the strong leadership factor; these items were randomly distributed throughout the instrument.

Completed SAQs were received from 2,145 teachers in the spring of 1984 (69% return rate), and 2,303 teachers one year later (74% return rate). The Strong Leadership variable was constructed from the 19 Likert items. The scale ranged from 19 to 95, with actual mean scores for schools in this study ranging from 54.9 to 88.3.

Reliability of the strong leadership factor was estimated using several procedures. In terms of internal consistency, analysis of spring 1984 data yielded a Cronbach Alpha of .93. In addition, the SAQ was administered to a random sample of 125 teachers in five urban schools, and 139 teachers in six rural school districts; Cronbach Alphas of .97 and .93, respectively, were obtained. For the principal leadership variable, test-retest reli-

ability based on a three-week interval with an N of 30 teachers was .89; based on a one-year interval with the same principals in the same schools, (N = 63), test-retest reliability was estimated at .723.

Method

The SAQ was administered by trained effective schools representatives in each school. Data were gathered at a staff meeting conducted by the effective schools representative. All responses were recorded on mark sense forms with no subject identification; thus the anonymity of the respondent was assured. All data were returned to the research team by schools. The Evaluation Services office of the school district optically scanned all answer sheets and provided the research team with individual items as well as school mean scores on all characteristics. All demographic data and student academic achievement were gathered from each individual student's master file maintained by the school district.

As noted earlier, 33 of the original 67 schools had a sufficient number of students in each subgrouping to be included in the study. In these schools there was a total of 3,515 students included in the data analysis. Of these 3,515 students, 1,633 were White, 1,021 were Black, 1.226 were free-lunch students, and 2,114 were non-free lunch students.

Current literature is divided on the best measure of improvement in academic achievement. Several measures (total scores, individual score, or gain scores) could be used to test the relationships hypothesized in this study; however, since the primary focus of this study was to examine "value adding" from schooling and to examine differential relationships between disaggregated student achievement by surrogate SES and ethnicity--variables normally held constant in residual gain score analyses, our final analysis used student gain scores. The main concern with the use of gain scores as measures of improvement is reliability of each individual students score (See Cronbach and Ferby, 1970; and Rogosa and Willett, 1983). Sensitive to this criticism, we employed a three-step process to examine the relationship between student academic achievement and our leadership variable.

School gain scores, prior achievement scores (NCE scores for Spring 1982 CAT), and NCE scores for Spring 1984 CAT, were used for the data analyses. First, multiple regressions were used to determine the strength of the leadership score and student achievement gain scores and to assess the relationship between the leadership of the principal and other effective school characteristics. Regression analyses were used to predict spring 1984 NCE scores from prior achievement (spring 1982 NCE scores) and the leadership of the school principal variable. Where no significant relationship was found between prior achievement and spring 1984 NCE scores, simple regressions were used to estimate the relationship between the leadership of the principal and gain scores. Analysis of variance was

used to assess the effect of the leadership treatment condition on gain scores in both Total Reading and Total Math.

The procedures used in this study have minimized the impact of the lack of reliability in gain scores by aggregating individual student gain scores to an average school gain score. The elimination of schools with less than 10 students in any subgroup results in averages less sensitive to the vagaries of testing. The correlation between individual 1982 and 1984 CAT scores for all students in the same school for the project period was .79 for Reading and .73 for Math ($p < .001$).

Specific hypotheses tested in the study were that children who have attended schools that were administered by principals who were strong instructional leaders would have (1) significantly greater increases in NCE scores for total reading and total mathematics than would children who have attended schools where principals are not strong instructional leaders; and (2) the leadership of the principal would be significantly related to other school variables.

Results

The results from the regression analysis are presented in Table 1.

As can be seen in Table 1, these multiple regression analyses predict 1984 CAT scores on the basis of 1982 CAT NCE scores and the leadership variable. Using the school as the unit of analysis, separate regressions were run using the same schools with different subsets of their populations. No school had less than 10 students in any of these subgroupings (Black, White, Free Lunch, No Lunch). These analyses suggest that 1984 NCE scores are strongly related to 1982 gain scores for all subgroups except Blacks in Reading and Math. These analyses simply confirm that on the school level and individual level, in most cases the best predictor of future level of achievement is prior achievement.

In those cases where prior achievement is significant (all cases except for Black students), positive coefficients for the principal leadership variable indicate that this variable accounts for additional variation in school averages. Coefficients significant at the .05 level were obtained for all students (Reading and Mathematics), free-lunch students (Reading and Mathematics), and White students (Reading).

Table 1
Multiple Regressions with 1984 Scores as Dependent Variable

Group	Type	Constant	1982 Score	Leadership	R^2 (F Stat)
Overall	Reading	6.12	.757 **	.146 *	.72 **
(coefficients)		(6.275)	(.0878)	(.5710)	(42.24)
(Standard error)					
White	Reading	4.65	.791 **	.157 *	.85 **
		(5.75)	(.06232)	(.0638)	(88.52)
Black	Reading	27.67 **	.379	.061	.12
		(11.64)	(.1865)	(.0799)	(2.12)
Free Lunch	Reading	7.55	.638 **	.177 *	.37 **
		(10.34)	(.1703)	(.0709)	(8.78)
No Lunch	Reading	8.01	.766 **	.134	.73
		(7.1)	(.0896)	(.06793)	(40.41)
Overall	Mathematics	7.87	.612 **	.236 *	.44 **
		(11.18)	(.1728)	(.0896)	(11.69)
White	Mathematics	2.21	.784 **	.180	.60
		(10.35)	(.1301)	(.1090)	(22.40)
Black	Mathematics	31.34 *	.186	.149	.09
		(12.48)	(.1667)	(.0873)	(1.527)
Free Lunch	Mathematics	11.38	.447 **	.270 *	.37 **
		(10.23)	(.1544)	(.0837)	(8.99)
No Lunch	Mathematics	11.28	.614 **	.209	.41 **
		(11.93)	(.1571)	(.1126)	(10.76)

* Significant beyond the .05 level
** Significant beyond the .01 level

As further indicated in Table 1, 72 percent of the variance in reading was accounted for by prior achievement (1982 NCE score) and the leadership of the principal. The disaggregated analysis suggests that as much as 85 percent of the variance of White student achievement is accounted for by these variables; however, when controlling for 1982 NCE scores in reading and mathematics for Black students only, 12 percent and 9 percent of the variance, respectively, was accounted for in 1984 NCE scores.

The absence of significance for the coefficient for 1982 CAT scores for Blacks in both reading and math suggests that it is appropriate to examine the relationship between these students and their gain scores without controlling for the prior achievement (1982 NCE scores). It appears that, aggregated to the school level, prior achievement is not as important for Blacks as it is for other groups. Thus, in Table 2 are presented simple regressions for Blacks using only the leadership variable.

Table 2
Simple Regression with Gainscores as the Dependent Variable

Group	Type	Constant	Leadership	R^2 (F Stat)
Black	Reading	-6.25 (6.49)	.1200 (.0898)	.05 (1.76)
Black	Mathematics	-22.93 ** (7.47)	.3350 ** (.1033)	.25 ** (10.500)

** Significant beyond the .01 level

As can be seen in Table 2, a significant relationship was found between Black student gain score in mathematics and the leadership of the principal ($R^2 = .25$; $p < .001$). However, no significant relationship was found between the leadership of the principal and Black student gain scores in reading.

The coefficients in the regression analysis, while helpful in our understanding of the relationship among the variables, have little practical application in our understanding of the larger construct of strong leadership. It is difficult to meaningfully interpret 1-point changes in a

scale treated as a continuous variable. Thus, in an additional step in analyzing the nature of the relationship between the leadership of the principal and student gain scores, a discrete leadership variable was created from the continuous leadership scores.

The 33 schools were divided into three equal groups of schools based upon the principal leadership variable score. The highest scoring within this group were labeled strong leaders and the lowest scoring were labeled weak leaders. In this manner it is easier for us to gauge at the applied level the magnitude of effects that are being measured. Analysis of variance was used to determine any significant differences in gain scores of students based upon the three groups of principals. In addition, the grouping provided a convenient way to illustrate the homogeneity of the populations served by the schools in all groups.

The three groups, based on the rating of principals by the teachers in the school on strong instructional leadership, were Strong Leader, $X = 80.4$; Average Leader, $X = 72.2$; and Weak Leader, $X = 62.9$. Schools in each group were comparable in size, percentage of ethnic minority children, and percentage of children participating in the free-lunch program. The mean leadership score for each group was approximately one standard deviation higher or lower than its next nearest leadership group. The Total Reading and Total Math average NCE scores at the beginning of the study are presented in Table 3.

As can be seen in Table 3, there were no significant differences between the various groups of schools in the mean scores for all students in Total Reading ($p < .533$) and Total Math ($p < .453$) scores. For example, the mean score for Total Reading of students in schools that had principals who were strong instructional leaders was 53.73, average leaders 56.95, and weak leaders, 53.81. The mean Total Mathematics scores were 56.13, 57.72, and 54.93, respectively for the Strong Leader, Average Leader and Weak Leader groups.

When the data were disaggregated by ethnic groups, there were no differences between the three Leadership Groups. There were no significant differences when children within these schools were grouped by ethnic group (Black or White) or for surrogate SES (Free Lunch or No Free Lunch). However, when compared within groups, there were differences between the average achievement for Total Reading of White students (63.20) and Black students (46.96), and for Total Math of White students (62.62) and Black Students (45.17). However, these differences were consistent across the three groups of schools when the study began in 1982. A similar disproportionality can be observed in the Total Reading and Total Math scores when disaggregated by the Surrogate SES measure (Free- or No-Free-Lunch Status). Free Lunch students scored on the average 14 to 16 NCE points below their more affluent counterparts. On the other hand, there were no significant differences between the three leadership groups of schools when compared on their NCE scores at the beginning of the study.

Table 3
Summary of 1982 NCE Mean Scores for Total Reading
and Total Mathematics by Groups

Group and Test Score	All Schools	Leader Group: Strong Leader	Leader Group: Average Leader	Leader Group: Weak Leader	F Test Significance
1982 READING CAT NCE					
All Students	54.83	53.74	56.95	53.81	.533
Ethnic Groups					
White	63.20	63.36	65.25	62.00	.533
Black	46.69	45.97	47.75	47.35	.218
Surrogate SES					
No Lunch	61.34	61.21	63.14	59.68	.367
Free Lunch	45.17	44.15	46.56	44.80	.471
1982 MATH CAT NCE					
All Students	56.26	56.13	57.72	54.93	.453
Ethnic Groups					
White	62.62	62.32	64.58	61.06	.459
Black	47.79	46.11	48.95	48.27	.308
Surrogate SES					
No Lunch	61.75	62.66	62.68	59.73	.308
Free Lunch	47.68	47.01	49.05	46.98	.635

The resulting mean scores and significance of F-tests from the analyses of variance using leader group as the independent variable and average gain scores as the dependent variable are presented in Table 4.

As can be seen in Table 4, the results of the ANOVA for Total Reading gain scores suggest that there were signficant differences between the three groups of schools ($F = 4.35$; $p < .017$). Using the Tukey (a) procedure for testing differences between simple mean scores resulted in the following conclusions: (1) Students in schools administered by principals who were rated by their teachers as strong instructional leaders had significantly greater gain scores in Total Reading ($X = 4.40$) than did students in schools administered by principals rated as average ($X = 1.57$) or schools administered by principals rated as weak ($X = 1.82$); (2) Students in schools administered by principals who were rated by their teachers as strong instructional leaders had significantly greater gain scores in Total Reading for students who received free lunches ($F = 6.05$; $p < .003$). The Tukey (a) procedure resulted in the conclusion that free-lunch children who attended schools that were administered by principals who were strong leaders had significantly higher gain scores ($X = 5.87$) than did their counterparts who attended schools administered by average principals ($X = 2.00$), or schools administered by weak principals ($X = 1.10$).

The disaggregated achievement analysis suggested that for all subgroups there were wide variations in the gain scores of students. All subgroups of students' achievement was positive in the direction of the students in school administered by strong instructional leaders. For Black student Total Reading gain scores, Black students in Strong Leader schools gained an average of 4.57 points compared to 1.38 and 0.92 for the average and weak groups, respectively; these differences were not sufficient to achieve the .05 level of significance.

The results of the ANOVAs for Total Math gain scores were similar to those in Reading. However, a greater number of significant differences were found. Significant differences were found for Total Math gain scores ($F = 3.52$; $p < .034$); white student gains ($F = 3.60$; $p < .039$); Black student gains ($F = 6.50$; $p < .009$); and free lunch student gains ($F = 5.93$; $p < .005$). The results from the Tukey (a) analyses found the differences in favor of the students in schools administered by principals who were strong instructional leaders. The most significant gains were for Black students ($X = 4.43$) and free lunch students $X = 5.97$) in Strong Leader schools. While Black students attending schools with principals with strong leaders gained on the average 4.43 points over the two-year period of time, Black students in schools administered by weak leaders lost on the average 2.34 points over the two-year period of time. Poor students gained an average of 5.97 points in schools administered by strong leaders, and lost on the average of .09 points during the same period of time in schools administered by weak leaders.

Table 4
Reading and Math Two Year Gain Scores
(1982-1984) by Group

Group and Test Score	All Schools (n=33)	Leader Group: Strong Leader (n=11)	Leader Group: Average Leader (n=11)	Leader Group: Weak Leader (n=11)	F-Test Significance
TOTAL READING GAIN 1982-194					
All Students	2.72	4.80	1.57	1.82	.017 *
Ethnic Groups					
White	2.53	4.34	1.80	1.47	.104
Black	2.37	4.80	1.48	.92	.055
Surrogate SES					
No Lunch	2.92	4.78	1.90	2.10	.093
Free Lunch	3.00	5.87	2.00	1.10	.003 **
TOTAL MATH GAIN 1982-1984					
All Students	1.75	4.45	-.405	1.21	.035 *
Ethnic Groups					
White	1.06	3.50	-1.88	1.53	.039 *
Black	1.14	4.43	1.34	-2.34	.009 **
Surrogate SES					
No Lunch	1.48	3.78	-.93	1.60	.142
Free Lunch	2.24	5.97	.83	-.09	.005 **

* = Significance beyond .05 level.
** = Significance beyond .01 level.

The final analysis of this study was designed to examine the relationship between the strong leadership variable and other school staff variables measured in the study. In addition to the strong leadership variable, eight additional variables are measured with the staff questionnaire. The correlations between these staff variables and the strong leader variable are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Intercorrelation Matrix of Strong Leadership and Early Identification (ID); Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress (FRMN); High Expectations (HIEX); Multicultural Education (MUCU); Positive Learning Climate (PLCT); Sex Equity (SXEQ); Curriculum Continuity (CUCO); and Dedicated Staff (DEDSTF).

	ID	FRMN	HIEX	MUCU	PLCT	SXEQ	CUCO	DEDSTF
Strong Leader	.31*	.75***	.40**	.40**	.64***	.53***	.24	.255

* Significant beyond .05 level
** Significant beyond .01 level
*** Significant beyond .001 level

As can be seen in Table 5, the leadership of the principal was related to six of the eight variables. The leadership of the principal was not significantly related to curriculum continuity ($R = .24$) and staff dedication ($R = .25$). The variables most highly related to strong leadership were those identified by Edmonds--namely, Positive Learning Climate ($R = .64$, $p < .001$); Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress ($R = .73$, $p < .001$); and High Expectations ($R = .40$; $p < .01$). Other variables related to climate and equity issues in this study were significant: Staff Perception of Sex Equity issues ($R = .53$; $p < .001$); Multicultural Education ($R = .40$; $p < .01$); and Early Identification of Learning Difficulties ($R = .31$; $p < .05$)

Implications

The findings of this study suggest that perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader are critical to the reading and mathematics achievement of students, particularly among historically low-achieving groups of students. To the extent that we value the principal as an instructional leader--and to the extent that we value improved academic achievement of all students--the findings have major implications for educational policy.

Before discussing these implications, the need for additional research should be noted. Qualitative analyses are currently being conducted by the research team to determine the particular sets of behaviors (beyond the general areas of mobilizing resources, communicating, serving as instructional resource, and being a visible presence) that are associated with Strong Leader principals. The findings from these analyses will contribute to the formulation of specific recommendations and the conduct of further research.

In terms of general policy development, however, the findings from the current study suggest implications for four areas: (1) preservice training of principals, (2) selection of principals, (3) continuing education of principals, and (4) evaluation of principals.

Preservice Training

To the extent that certain behaviors of principals are associated with improved academic achievement of all students, those behaviors should provide a primary focus for principal preservice training programs. The predictive validity of admissions criteria should be examined in light of study findings. Desired behaviors should be reinforced during training programs, and should be an integral part of training program exit criteria.

Selection of Principals

School districts should review their selection criteria for principals in light of the study findings and in terms of their obligations to provide quality education programs for all students. The findings clearly suggest a relationship between principal behaviors and academic achievement. Criteria to predict these behaviors should become a fundamental part of the

selection process. At the same time, these criteria should be made explicit to those responsible for preservice training. Careful articulation is necessary to maintain a sufficient pool of applicants who meet the criteria and to minimize the need for retraining of newly selected personnel.

It can be seen that the preservice training programs in higher education and the school districts both have responsibilities for the selection of principals. As such, the delineation of selection criteria is a task involving an often delicate and tenuous relationship between two institutions. School districts should not see their task as dictating the specific nature, scope, and procedures of any given principal training program. At the same time, it must be recognized that districts have an obligation to select principals in accordance with specified needs, and training programs should, within normally accepted professional standards, be responsive to those needs.

Continuing Education

Systematic application of relevant selection criteria should, over a period of a few years, result in a high level of congruence between a school district's expectations for principals and the behavior of those newly selected. Virtually all school districts, however, are in non-original situations, with principals already in place and principal turnover rates relatively low. In such instances, school districts should examine their continuing education programs to ensure that the desired principal behaviors are reinforced.

Principal Evaluation

Many school districts are wont to adopt edifying goals for principals, but then proceed to evaluate principals on bases unrelated to those goals. In light of the findings of this study, school districts should examine their formal processes for evaluation of principals. Expectations for desired behaviors should be made explicit, and should become the fundamental basis for principal evaluation.

(160)6R

References

Andrews, R. L., and R. Soder. The Search for Equity and Excellence: University/School District Collaboration on Effective Schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1985a.

Andrews, R. L., and R. Soder. "University/District Collaboration on Effective Schools." National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal 2 (1985b): 33-48.

Andrews, R. L., A. V. Houston, and R. Soder. "The Search for Excellence and Equity: Seattle's Effective Schools project." The Effective School Report 3, No. 9 (1985): 1, 6-7.

Austin, G. R. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness. Eucational Leadership 37, No. 1 (1979): 10-14.

Blumbert, A., and W. Greenfield. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

Brookover, W. B. and L. W. Lezotte. Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing, Mich.: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1977.

Brookover, W. B. et al. School Social Systems and Student Achievement. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Brookover, W. B. et al. Creating Effective Schools. Holmes Beach, Fla.: Learning Publications, 1982.

Cronbach, L. J., and L. Furby. "How Should We Measure 'change'--or should we?" Psychological Bulletin 74, No. 1 (1970): 68-80.

De Bevoise, W. "Synthesis of Research on the Principal as Instructional Leader." Educational Leadership, February 1984.

Dow, I. I., and R. Y. Whitehead. "Curriculum Implementation Study, Physical Education k-6: Personal Well Being." Funded under contract with the Carlton Board of Education, University of Ottawa, September, 1980.

Edmonds, R. R. "A discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling." Paper presented at CEMREL's National Conference on Urban Education, St. Louis, July 1978.

Edmonds, R. R. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37, No. 1 (1979a): 15-27.

Edmonds, R. R. "Some Schools Work and More Can." Social Policy 9, No. 5: (1979b): 28-32.

Edmonds, R. R., and J. R. Frederiksen. "Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools that are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children," 1979. ERIC ED 170 396.

Edmonds, R. R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership 40, No. 3 (1982): 4-11

Fredericksen, J. R., and R. R. Edmonds. "Identification of Instructionally Effective and Ineffective Schools." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Fullan, M. "The principal." In The Meaning of Educational Change. New York: York: Teachers College Press, 1981.

Giammetteo, M. C., & D. M. Giammetteo. Forces on Leadership. Reston, Vir.: NASSP, 1981

Glasman, N. S. "Student Achievement and the School Principal." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 6, No. 3 (1984): 283-296.

Gross, N., J. Giacquinta, and M. Bernstein. Implementating Organizational Innovations. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Iannaconne, L., and R. Jamgochian. "High Performing Curriculum and Instructional Leadership in the Climate of Excellence." NASSP Bulletin, May 1985.

Lezotte, L., and J. Passalacqua. "Individual School Buildings: Accounting for Differences Differences in Measured Pupil Performance." Urban Education 13 (1978): 283-293.

Lipham, J. M. Effective Principal, Effective School. Reston, Vir.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

Mackenzie, D. E. "Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of some Recent Trends." Educational Research 12, No. 4 (1983): 5-16.

Manasse, L. A. "Principals as Leaders of High-performing Systems." Educational Leadership, February 1984.

Murphy, J., P. Hallinger, and A. Mitman. "Problems with Research on Educational Leadership: Issues to be Addressed." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 5, No. 3 (1983): 297-305.

Persell, C., and P. Cookson. "The Effective Principal in Action." The Effective Principal: A Research Summary, 1982. (NASSP).

Purkey, S. C., and M. S. Smith. "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership 39 (1982): 64-69.

Purkey, S. C., and M. S. Smith. "Effective Schools: A Review." The Elementary School Journal 83, No. 4 (1983): 427-452.

Reinhardt, D. et al. "A Study of the Principal's Role in Externally Funded Change Projects and the Implication of/for In-service Training, Vol. 1." A technical report for the University of Oregon Teacher Corps Project, July 1979.

Rogosa, D. R., and J. B. Willett. "Demonstrating the Reliability of the Difference Score in the Measurement of Change." Journal of Educational Measurement 20, No. 4 (Winter 1983): 335-343.

Rosenblum, S., and J. Jastrzab. "The Surveys of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA): Implications of the IEA Surveys of Achievement." In Educational Policy and International Assessment, edited by A. C. Purvis and D. V. Levine. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.

Rutherford, W. "School Principals as Effective Leaders." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (1985): 31-34.

Sapone, C. O. "Curriculum: The Basis for Instructional Leadership and the Principal's Role." Catalyst for Change 14, No. 2, No. 2 (1985): 4-7.

Schmuck, R. "Leadership for Organizational Development." Phi Delta Kappan 41 (1984): 13.

Sergiovanni, T. J. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan 41 (1984): 4-13.

Soder, R., and R. L. Andrews. "University/district Collaboration on Effective Schools: A Resource Enhancement Model." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984.

Soder, R., and R. L. Andrews. "The Moral Imperatives of Compulsory Schooling." Curriculum in Context, Summer, 1985, pp. 6-8, 12.

Sweeney, J. "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership 39 (1982): 346-352.

Torrens, S. E., and D. J. S. Wing. "Strong Leadership in the Daily Operation of Effective Schools." Unpublished paper, College of Education, University of Washington, 1986.

Weber, G. Inner-City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

Wellisch, J. B., A. H. Macqueen, R. A. Carriere, and G. A. Duck. "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." Sociology of Education 51 (1978): 221-226.

Wilson, K. "An Effective School Principal." Educational Leadership 39 (1982): 357-361.

APPENDIX A

Individual School Data: Reading

READING School	Leader	All	Free	No Lunch	White	Black
1	88.3					
82 NCE (rounded)		58	50	62	63	52
GAIN		5.45	5.36	5.09	4.79	-2.73
NUMBER STUDENTS		169	58	98	76	15
2	85.9					
		58	47	63	66	46
		3.40	-4.54	3.21	4.93	.81
		126	35	78	54	36
3	85.6					
		61	49	67	69	48
		2.49	2.52	2.21	2.51	3.12
		110	33	71	59	26
4	84.1					
		67	44	76	84	44
		2.42	7.25	.19	-1.47	7.56
		88	24	63	45	19
5	80.8					
		55	49	63	60	47
		1.26	.66	1.65	-.69	2.93
		101	53	43	48	27
6	78.0					
		55	47	60	59	48
		-.02	0.0	1.29	2.46	-1.10
		63	26	31	28	21
7	77.4					
		51	41	62	61	42
		11.06	8.56	14.08	11.17	10.03
		85	39	36	30	36
8	76.2					
		51	47	53	51	46
		5.01	7.94	3.55	5.58	4.68
		117	33	69	45	19
9	76.4					
		51	45	57	57	43
		5.92	8.17	4.31	7.77	6.67
		77	41	14	24	15
10	75.8					
		65	49	71	73	53
		4.90	8.83	4.17	1.57	11.78
		103	24	70	60	22
11	75.8					
		50	48	54	57	44
		10.88	10.76	12.79	9.08	9.13
		60	41	14	24	15
12	75.6					
		56	41	61	67	43
		4.71	7.16	4.31	4.68	4.14
		245	51	177	120	29

13	74.2					
		60	45	67	73	45
		1.62	3.85	.41	-.15	3.56
		154	39	100	79	61
14	73.7					
		51	45	55	56	48
		3.54	2.54	4.86	6.00	1.27
		71	24	70	60	22
15	72.9					
		62	64	66	69	52
		4.00	.81	4.68	5.41	3.00
		50	16	28	29	11
16	72.8					
		55	48	59	61	49
		.88	3.11	.39	-1.48	3.25
		51	18	28	25	12
17	72.8					
		63	52	59	74	50
		3.16	2.88	4.80	7.18	.52
		106	32	61	45	48
18	71.4					
		53	46	57	51	50
		-.87	-3.83	.94	2.00	-5.67
		54	18	31	30	15
19	71.1					
		66	49	72	76	49
		3.02	4.70	2.31	1.51	4.33
		168	40	115	86	66
20	70.8					
		66	50	72	72	53
		-1.25	-.83	-1.38	-.78	-1.18
		53	12	40	32	17
21	70.8					
		62	50	67	76	48
		-.82	-2.81	.81	-2.62	-.57
		55	16	36	21	23
22	68.2					
		60	48	64	65	46
		-.70	4.50	-1.26	-1.97	2.50
		47	12	31	32	12
23	67.3					
		54	43	62	60	45
		2.83	.33	2.74	2.24	-1.58
		40	15	23	17	12
24	66.6					
		58	51	62	67	44
		1.84	-.02	3.14	-.35	4.09
		110	36	66	49	34
25	66.3					
		51	48	54	57	54
		1.51	.37	2.88	2.02	-5.27
		128	35	67	60	15
26	66.1					
		61	50	69	69	50

		2.95	2.76	3.02	2.89	2.42
		144	45	87	76	48
27	66.0					
		47	43	57	50	44
		5.62	4.21	6.84	5.59	3.76
		163	84	51	82	21
28	63.9					
		59	54	61	60	44
		3.47	4.13	3.08	2.76	7.73
		66	16	49	33	11
29	63.7					
		54	50	59	59	47
		1.29	1.00	1.52	2.07	.76
		150	53	79	46	67
30	59.7					
		59	54	60	65	54
		-3.15	-4.91	-1.63	-.72	-5.09
		78	22	51	32	45
31	59.6					
		60	46	71	73	50
		.38	3.32	-2.40	-2.44	.44
		82	31	43	34	18
32	58.1					
		62	49	70	73	52
		.19	-.07	.24	-1.03	-.26
		272	90	165	117	110
33	54.9					
		51	45	54	54	48
		3.05	.98	3.69	3.10	3.17
		115	47	61	50	47
TOTAL STUDENTS		3515	1152	2050	1637	1011

Individual School Data: Math

MATH School	Leader	All	Free	No Lunch	White	Black
1	88.3					
82 NCE (rounded)		65	60	68	65	51
GAIN		5.32	5.26	4.98	3.73	6.00
NUMBER STUDENTS		169	58	99	77	15
2	85.9					
		57	46	62	61	44
		3.94	4.26	3.27	5.00	1.19
		126	35	78	54	36
3	85.6					
		62	53	66	68	49
		4.25	5.52	3.75	3.33	3.63
		110	33	73	58	24
4	84.1					
		65	40	76	82	43
		10.18	15.60	7.51	7.74	12.42
		88	25	61	43	36
5	80.8					
		58	54	63	62	49
		-.25	.88	-2.02	-3.94	2.37
		101	50	44	47	27
6	78.0					
		61	51	69	67	51
		-3.37	-.52	-5.90	-5.45	-4.76
		63	27	31	29	21
7	77.4					
		56	48	63	65	44
		11.34	8.92	14.54	11.61	11.47
		85	39	37	31	36
8	76.2					
		57	53	58	57	50
		9.44	10.64	8.20	7.80	8.42
		117	33	69	45	19
9	76.4					
		58	57	59	60	51
		.24	1.57	-1.87	1.10	-.57
		77	42	30	31	21
10	75.8					
		61	48	65	65	51
		3.85	9.96	2.45	3.98	5.50
		103	23	67	57	22
11	75.8					
		55	53	60	61	51
		3.83	3.63	6.71	3.67	3.14
		60	41	14	24	15
12	75.6					

		62	53	64	69	47
		1.89	4.42	1.18	.91	.79
		245	50	179	122	28
13	74.2					
		60	44	67	71	46
		2.46	4.18	1.65	3.47	2.80
		154	40	101	79	63
14	73.7					
		50	51	51	57	46
		3.03	-2.39	5.30	.68	3.60
		71	23	37	19	43
15	72.9					
		59	51	61	69	39
		6.86	6.31	8.75	4.00	10.91
		50	16	28	29	11
16	72.8					
		60	55	64	66	52
		-3.00	1.25	-5.68	-4.96	-2.71
		51	20	28	25	14
17	72.8					
		65	58	70	75	54
		.17	-.37	.79	-1.05	.54
		106	35	58	44	50
18	71.4					
		64	54	70	67	54
		-7.75	-7.22	-9.61	-9.68	-5.06
		54	18	33	31	17
19	71.1					
		63	47	71	73	46
		3.47	4.44	2.50	3.26	4.71
		168	39	115	85	65
20	70.8					
		68	58	71	72	58
		-4.62	-9.33	-3.13	-4.16	-5.94
		53	12	40	32	17
21	70.8					
		64	53	70	75	53
		-2.88	.74	-4.32	-5.09	-.62
		55	19	37	22	26
22	68.2					
		63	47	69	68	50
		-4.06	7.08	-7.71	-7.97	5.77
		47	13	31	32	13
23	67.3					
		54	51	55	55	55
		5.22	-2.80	8.96	7.22	-4.08
		40	15	24	18	12
24	66.6					
		62	56	66	67	48
		1.52	-.67	2.25	1.88	1.91
		110	36	67	50	34
25	66.3					
		54	48	58	59	53
		-3.91	-.41	-4.95	-5.26	-10.67

26	66.1	128	44	65	58	15
		58	52	63	63	50
		6.43	2.39	8.16	7.93	2.02
27	66.0	144	44	88	76	48
		53	49	61	57	47
		3.75	3.32	3.26	.98	4.29
28	63.9	163	88	50	81	21
		59	59	59	56	51
		3.52	-1.22	5.14	4.83	-3.33
29	63.7	66	18	50	35	12
		55	51	60	56	50
		1.40	-.13	1.61	3.83	-1.39
30	59.7	150	53	79	46	67
		58	51	60	62	55
		-5.03	-3.87	-4.85	-2.64	-7.00
31	59.6	78	23	52	33	46
		66	53	76	74	61
		-.17	2.33	-3.05	-.59	-4.72
32	58.1	82	30	43	34	18
		62	50	69	72	52
		-2.12	-1.18	-2.71	-4.73	-1.39
33	54.9	272	90	162	113	110
		54	50	55	55	52
		2.71	1.24	3.81	3.45	-1.47
		129	41	79	73	19
Total N		3515	1226	2114	1633	1021

APPENDIX B

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Climate

THE SCHOOL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about your work and various ideas you may have about your school. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly.

A separate answer sheet is furnished for your responses. Fill in the information requested on the answer sheet. You will notice there is no place for your name. Please DO NOT record your name. All responses will be strictly confidential and results will be reported by groups only. PLEASE DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET:

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you Strongly Agree (A), Agree (B), are Undecided (C), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (E) with each statement. Mark your answers on the mark sense form provided in the following manner:

	SA A	A B	U C	D D	SD E
If you Strongly Agree with the statement, blacken space A.	■	( )	( )	( )	( )
If you Agree with the statement, blacken space B.	( )	■	( )	( )	( )
If you are unsure or Undecided, blacken space C.	( )	( )	■	( )	( )
If you Disagree with the statement, blacken space D.	( )	( )	( )	■	( )
If you Strongly Disagree, blacken space E.	( )	( )	( )	( )	■

All marks should be heavy and completely fill the answer space. If you change a response, erase the first mark completely. Make no stray marks on the answer sheet. Please do not mark this booklet.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NOTE: Items marked with an asterisk pertain to the Strong Leadership dimension.

TEACHER ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		A	B	C	D	E
	1. Drug and alcohol abuse are problems in this school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
*	2. My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	3. What I teach in my class contributes to the content of the grade or course that follows it.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	4. I enjoy working at this school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	5. Staff members assume responsibility for discipline in my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	6. Problems in this school are recognized and worked on.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
*	7. My principal promotes staff development activities for faculty.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	8. I feel there are procedures open to me to go to a higher authority if a decision has been made that seems unfair.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	9. Discipline is not a problem in my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	10. My principal uses direct observation in forming judgments about my performance.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	11. Our school has a set of goals that everyone understands.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	12. Students can count on staff members to listen to their side of the story and be fair.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	13. The atmosphere of our school is responsive to cultural, ethnic, and language differences.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
14. The curriculum of our school is multiethnic and multicultural.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. The physical condition of my school is generally pleasant and well-kept.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. School rules are enforced equally for everyone.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. Teachers and staff members take a real interest in their students' future.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
* 18. My principal is an active participant in staff development.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. I rely heavily on teaching materials that I develop myself for classroom lessons and activities.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. People are clear about their rights and responsibilities in my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
* 21. Teachers in my school turn to the principal with instructional concerns or problems.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. Assemblies and special activities at our school reflect the ethnic and cultural diversity in the Seattle community.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. Staff members of our school are sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. What I teach in my class builds upon the content of the grade or course that <u>precedes</u> <u>it</u>.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. The administrators of my school are responsive to students' needs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
26. Discussions with my principal result in improved instructional practice.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. The goals/objectives the district specifies for my courses or grade level are appropriate.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging my performance.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. People in my school are willing to listen to the ideas and feelings of others, even when they disagree.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. Bulletin boards and other displays in our school reflect ethnic and culture pluralism.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. Our school's staff examines instructional materials for ethnic and racial bias.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
34. My principal makes frequent classroom observations.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
35. My principal mobilizes support to help achieve academic goals.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
36. A positive feeling permeates this school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. There is a lot of encouragement and personal support among people at school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
38. My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
39. Students in my school abide by school rules.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
40. What I teach in my class is basically the same as classes like mine in other schools in the district.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
41. Students are given meaningful ways of being involved in the leadership of the school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
42. My principal's evaluation of my performance helps me improve my teaching.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
43. The goals/objectives the district specifies for my courses or class are important.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
44. Staff at our school has high expectations of academic achievement for students of all ethnic groups.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
45. Our school has an atmosphere that encourages me to express my ideas.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
46. Our school's curriculum helps students view ideas from diverse ethnic perspectives and points of view.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
47. The school rules are fair.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
48. Student behavior is generally positive at my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
49. My principal communicates clearly to me regarding instructional matters.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
50. Discipline is fair and related to violations of agreed-upon rules.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
51. The classroom atmosphere in my school is conducive to learning for students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
52. My principal is an important instructional resource person in our school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
53. My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
54. Stealing is a problem in this school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
55. District curriculum documents guide my planning of instruction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
56. Vandalism is a problem in my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
57. My principal respects my time as a scarce resource.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
58. My principal is a "visible presence" in our building to both staff and students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
59. Staff and students do not view security as an issue in my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
60 District adopted textbooks guide my planning of instruction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
61. I feel satisfied with my students' progress in school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
62. Our school provides its students with a strong multiethnic/multicultural education.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
63. I have a chance to present ideas when important decisions are made about programs in this school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
64. The atmosphere of our school is responsive to gender differences.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
65. Our school's staff examines instructional materials for sex bias.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
66. Students cut a lot of classes.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
67. Achievement test results guide my planning of instruction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
68. The teaching styles in our school are sensitive to the ethnic and cultural diversity of our students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
69. My principal is an effective disciplinarian.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
70. Staff at our school has the same expectations of academic achievement for both female and male students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
71. I teach basically the same content that is taught in other classes of the same grade or same course at my school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
72. This school makes students enthusiastic about learning.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
73. I would transfer to another school if I could.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
74. The content the district specifies for my courses or class is appropriate.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
75. Our school's curriculum helps students view ideas from both male and female perspectives.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
76. My principal provides frequent feedback regarding my classroom performance.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
77. The tests I develop guide my planning of instruction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
78. The teaching styles in our school are sensitive to the needs and concerns of both sexes.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
79. I am satisfied with the variety of extra-curricular activities at this school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
80. Procedures used to motivate students are fair to both sexes.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
81. Teachers know and treat students as individuals.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
82. My principal assists faculty in interpreting test results.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
83. My school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
84. The content the district specifies for my courses or grade level is important.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
85. My school is a safe and secure place to work.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
86. Staff members of our school are sensitive to the needs and concerns of both sexes.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
87. There is little sexist behavior among staff at our school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
88. My principal is a strong instructional leader.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
89. Our staff works best when it has a set of rules to follow.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
90. The district has too much control over our inservice training.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
91. Students with special learning needs in my class are not receiving the instructional program they need.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
92. My school has effective programs for students who are in need of remediation.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
93. Multiple assessment methods are used to assess student progress in basic skills (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery checklists, etc.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
94. My school has programs for students who are high achievers.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
95. Staff in our building want more control over the resources they need to do their jobs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
96. Student assessment information (such as criterion-referenced tests, skills checklists, etc.) is regularly used to give specific student feedback and plan appropriate instruction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
97. The district wants us to use more individual judgment in diagnosing student learning needs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
98. I expect most students in my school will perform below the national average in academic achievement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
99. No challenge is too tough for our staff.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
100. Every student should be a unique challenge for our staff.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
101. My principal has given me a clear understanding of my responsibilities regarding District homework policies and procedures.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
102. The principal in my school is aware of student progress in relation to instructional objectives.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
103. We do not have enough opportunity to exercise our own judgment outside the classroom.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
104. Most students in my school are capable of mastering grade level academic objectives.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
105. The district doesn't listen when we tell them our problems.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
106. I expect most students in my school will perform above national average in academic achievement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
107. The academic ability of students in my school compares favorably with students in other schools.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
108. Our staff does not want to make decisions about matters that do not affect our classrooms.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
109. The district is not aware of the good work we do.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
110. If a person in the building runs into trouble, someone helps him or her out.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
111. People in our building seek out training experiences that increase their ability to educate students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
112. Staff in our building have a great deal of trust.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
113. People in this building are willing to help out wherever they are needed.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
114. Staff in our school are proud of what they do.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
115. Nearly all of my students will be at or above grade level by the end of this year.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
116. If staff motivation is a problem, the district wants us to deal with it.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
117. The district wants us to be more goal-oriented.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
118. People in our building work hard to maintain good relations with parents.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
119. The judgment of fellow staff members should count more than the judgment of others in performance evaluations.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
120. The district wants us to be more colleague-oriented.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
121. Most of my students will show at least one year's growth in academic achievement this year.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
122. Morale is best when staff sticks with familiar routines.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
123. Staff in this building tries to do everything the district wants.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
124. Every member of our staff should have to obey the same set of rules.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
125. The district asks for too much information.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
126. The district respects ideas which come from building staff.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
127. The district wants us to put the welfare of our students ahead of our own welfare.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
128. The district thinks most problems are best solved by principals and faculty at the building level.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
129. Teachers should determine and set standards for the profession.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
130. Many of my students probably will leave school before high school graduation.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
131. Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
132. Teachers in my school generally believe most students are able to master the basic reading/ math skills.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
133. Our principal treats teachers as colleagues.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
134. School staff should try to have more influence over educational policy in this state.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
135. The district does not want us to participate in important policy decisions.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
136. I communicate to my students a clear understanding of their responsibilities regarding homework assignments.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
137. Staff in our building are loyal employees.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
138. The best ideas in our building come from our teachers.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
139. I regularly follow district procedures for assigning homework.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
140. Staff members should refuse to do things that are not good for students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
141. The principal uses test results to recommend changes in the instructional program.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
142. Most of the important planning in our school should be done by building staff.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
143. The district can count on us to give our best.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
144. Present district rules and regulations do not give staff enough protection.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
145. My school is responsive to students with special learning needs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
146. We do not get the respect we deserve from the district.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
147. My school has effective procedures for identifying students with special learning needs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
148. We are committed to working together as a faculty.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
149. The district does not know what is going on in schools.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
150. Our staff constantly looks for ways to do a better job.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
151. Our staff holds itself to the highest professional standards.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
152. The district would rather have a loyal staff than a competent staff.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
153. The district would be happier if teacher and principal organizations did not exist.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
154. Staff in our building want to be told what to do and how to do it.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
155. Most students in my school will perform at about the national average in academic achievement.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
156. Teachers in other schools would rate my school's level of academic achievement as good.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
157. Most of the students in my school will ultimately graduate from high school.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
158. Whatever it takes, people in our building solve problems.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
159. We are ready to learn to do our jobs in a new way if it will meet the needs of students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
160. The district treats us like children.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	A	B	C	D	E
161. Professional achievement is recognized and rewarded in our building.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
162. We have a strong sense of community in our building.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
163. Staff in this school really care about how much students learn.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
164. Staff review and analyze test results to plan instructional program changes.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
165. Our staff wants the principal and district to plan for our inservice learning needs.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
166. Teachers in my school frequently assess the progress of students in basic skills.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
167. Homework assigned in my class helps students' academic progress.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Spring 1985
(9)ESP.ST.S1,1B-15B